DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 806 TM 820 530

AUTHOR Russo, Nancy Felipe; And Others
TITLE Understanding the Manuscript Review Process: Increasing the Participation of Women.
INSTITUTION American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 52p.; Table 1 may be marginably legible, due to small print. Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Los Angeles, CA, 1981).
AVAILABLE FROM Nancy Felipe Russo, Ph.D., Administrative Officer for Women's Programs, American Psychological Association, 1200 17th Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Authors; Editing; *Females; Professional Recognition; *Psychologists; *Publications; Revision (Written Composition); *Scholarly Journals; Technical Writing
IDENTIFIERS Educators; *Manuscript Submission Procedures; *Writing for Publication

ABSTRACT

For the process leading to the publication of one's professional work to be equitable, all authors must understand why and how publication decisions are made. Psychologists must understand how editors and reviewers look at manuscripts, and how the author's own attitudes and skills may affect the acceptance of manuscripts. These four papers are based on presentations at the American Psychological Association symposium, "Understanding the Manuscript Review Process: Increasing the Participation of Women." The papers are intended to inform all psychologists, no matter in which area they may wish to publish. "An Editor Looks for the Perfect Manuscript," by Sandra Scarr, is presented from the perspective of a journal editor. "Overcoming Common Barriers to Publishing Psychological Work," by Stephanie B. Stolz, is an author's view. "Manuscript Faults and Review Board Recommendations: Lethal and Non-Lethal Errors," by Kathryn M. Bartol, is based on a survey of review board members. "Another Voice on the Publishing of Manuscripts," by Jacqueline Goodchilds, looks at the publishing system. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224806

American Psychological Association

UNDERSTANDING THE MANUSCRIPT REVIEW PROCESS:

INCREASING THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN

Committee on Women in Psychology

and

Women's Program Office

American Psychological Association, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy F. Russo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

For additional copies write:

Nancy Felipe Russo, Ph.D.
Administrative Officer for Women's Programs
American Psychological Association
1200 17th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Please include a self-addressed mailing label with your request.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction Dorothy Loeffler	1
1. An Editor Looks for the Perfect Manuscript Sandra Scarr	5
2. Overcoming Common Barriers to Publishing Psychological Work Stephanie B. Stolz	18
3. Manuscript Faults and Review Board Recommendations: Lethal and Non-Lethal Errors Kathryn M. Bartol	29
4. Another Voice on the Publishing of Manuscripts Jacqueline Goodchilds	46

Introduction

Dorothy Loeffler

The publication of one's professional work represents a very important recognition and visibility for that work, as well as for the author. In order that the process leading to publication be equitable, all professionals must understand the process of why and how decisions are made to publish or not publish a manuscript. Psychologists must understand how editors and reviewers look at manuscripts. In addition, they must understand how the author's own attitudes and skills may enhance or impede the acceptance of manuscripts. For a summary report of APA journal operations, 1980, see Table 1.

The articles in this monograph are based on presentations given by the authors at a symposium at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, 1981. The symposium, Understanding the Manuscript Review Process: Increasing the Participation of Women, was initiated by the Committee on Women in Psychology (CWP) and co-sponsored at the annual meeting by Divisions 1 and 35.

A summary of the recent Committee on Women in Psychology survey (American Psychologist, December, 1980) states that qualified women continue to be underrepresented in this process. 1980 data show women as editors (2 out of 22), as associate editors (5 out of 35), as consulting editors (123 out of 604), and as reviewers (1,173 out of 5,728). (See Table 2.) Most editors have acted in ways designed to increase the participation of women. These efforts have been more successful in some fields of psychology than others.

The information presented in these articles is intended to be informative to all psychologists no matter in which area they may wish to publish. Among the authors are women who have served, or are currently serving, as editors, reviewers, on editorial boards, and on the APA Publications and Communications Board. Although all have been contributors, Sandra Scarr writes from the perspective of a journal editor. Stephanie Stolz writes of the barriers that may exist within the author. Kathryn Bartol presents recommendations based on a survey of review board members. Jacqueline Goodchilds takes a look at the publishing system.

All writers offer positive suggestions for ways in which authors can work to increase the possibility of acceptance of their manuscripts. Their positions are as educators, and they write from their own experiences in the APA journal publication process.

Table 1

Summary Report of Journal Operations: 1980

The following summary is compiled from the 1980 annual reports of the Council of Editors and from Central Office records. The corresponding figures for 1979 can be found in the June 1980 issue of the *American Psychologist*.

Journal	Manuscripts				Printed pages			Subscriptions	
	No. received	No. accepted	No. pending	% rejected	Items published[a]	Total pages published[b]	Average lag in months	Member	Non-member
Primary Journals									
Journal of Abnormal Psychology	369	63	8	83	93	786	7	2,753	3,556
Journal of Applied Psychology	570	97	13	83	91	748	11	2,801	3,795
Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology	168	89	0	47	108	1,196	10	639	1,958
Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology	965	131	19	86	147	820	7	7,482	3,117
Journal of Educational Psychology	403	120	3	70	96	899	11	1,839	3,989
Psychological Bulletin	535	62	6	88	99	1,420	13	6,776	3,284
Journal of Counseling Psychology	399	87	0	78	87	650	9	4,146	3,213
Psychological Review	171	24	9	85	28	558	6	4,351	3,424
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	965	195	27	81	202	2,302	12	3,527	3,117
Developmental Psychology	594	107	39	81	96	699	7	3,243	2,185
Professional Psychology	271	92	0	66	165	996	16	4,226	966
JEP: General	87	28	0	68	22	497	17	1,398	2,429
JEP: Human Learning and Memory	222	51	0	77	62	814	5	1,409	2,400
JEP: Human Perception and Performance	235	73	0	69	61	789	14	1,399	2,415
JEP: Animal Behavior Processes	105	34	0	68	25	397	6	1,255	2,257
Subtotal or average	6,059	1,253	124	75	1,382	13,571	10	47,244	42,205
Special Journals									
American Psychologist	395	36	31	90	215	1,184	15	54,437	3,968
Contemporary Psychology	736	735	0	.1	1,044	969	4	5,136	2,733
Journal Supplement Abstract Service	368	200	41	39	194	150[c]	6	1,018	459
Subtotal or average	1,499	971	72	43	1,453	2,303	8	60,591	7,160
Grand total	7,558	2,224	196	59	2,835	15,874	NA	107,635	49,365
Secondary Journal									
Psychological Abstracts	NA	NA	NA	NA	26,844	5,824	NA	913[d]	4,192[e]

Note. All numbers are rounded off to the nearest whole number. In all instances, the rejection rate applied only to manuscripts on which actions were completed. NA = not applicable.

[a] Includes articles, brief reports, case reports, discussions, monographs, and brief substantive items. For the Journal Supplement Abstract Service and *Psychological Abstracts*, these items are abstracts.

[b] Editors' reported totals have been adjusted to the APA official page count, which includes tables of contents and author indexes.

[c] Applies only to the JSAS *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, not documents.

[d] Not exclusively members, includes individual nonmembers.

[e] Nonmembers are institutions only. Nonmember individuals appear in the Member column.

Table 2

NUMBER OF MEN, WOMEN, AND MINORITY INDIVIDUALS REPORTED AS SERVING ON EDITORIAL BOARDS IN 1980

JOURNALS	MEN				WOMEN				MINORITY INDIVIDUALS [a]			
	Eds	Assoc Eds	Cons Eds	Rev	Eds	Assoc Eds	Cons Eds	Rev	Eds	Assoc Eds	Cons Eds	Rev
Abnormal	1	1	27	219	-	-	5	53	-	-	-	-
Applied	1	2	25	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-
Comparative	1	1	28	98	-	-	3	7	-	-	-	-
Consulting	1	2	70	-	-	1	11	-	-	-	2	-
Educational	1	2	32	-	-	-	19	-	-	-	5	-
Bulletin [b]	1	2	-	437	-	-	-	63	-	-	-	7
Counseling	1	1	27	39	-	-	10	25	-	-	4	3
Review	1	-	7	178	-	-	1	24	-	-	-	-
JPSP:												
Attitudes	1	1	24	283	-	-	3	67	-	-	-	-
Interpersonal	1	-	15	168	-	-	5	54	-	-	-	-
Personality	1	-	6	312	-	-	2	83	-	-	-	-
Developmental [b]	-	3	32	236	1	1	12	177	-	-	-	3
Professional	1	-	52	69	-	-	13	24	-	-	5	2
JEP:General	1	-	7	61	-	-	3	8	-	-	-	2
JEP:Learning [b]	1	-	18	103	-	-	8	21	-	-	-	-
JEP:Perception	1	-	32	117	1	-	9	28	-	-	-	-
JEP:Animal	1	-	22	49	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
SUBTOTAL	16	15	424	2,369	2	2	108	634	-	-	17	18
AP	2	3	-	508	-	1	-	134	-	-	-	-
CP	1	2	35	665	-	-	7	186	-	-	1	-
JSAS	1	7	22	-	-	2	8	-	-	-	-	-
SUBTOTAL	4	12	57	1,173	-	3	15	320	-	-	1	-
GRAND TOTAL	20	27	481	3,542	2	5	123	954	-	-	18	18
1979 TOTALS	23	43	579	4,555	1	12	142	1,173	-	-	16	44
1978 TOTALS	19	37	485	3,416	1	11	112	838	-	-	12	10

a/ Most editors did not know the minority status of reviewers and therefore gave incomplete data or no data for this item.

b/ Editor-elect data.

2/20/81, Committee on Women in Psychology

An Editor Looks for the Perfect Manuscript

Sandra Scarr

Yale University

Dr. Scarr has her Ph.D. from Harvard University. She is currently Professor in the Department of Psychology at Yale University. She has been active in many professional organizations and, within APA, particularly in Division 7 where she is now President. She is the author of scores of articles, has about two dozen chapters in edited books, and has given many invited addresses. She has been Associate Editor for two publications, consulting editor for another two, and on the editorial boards of two others. She is Editor of Developmental Psychology and is on the APA Council of Editors.

I. The Perfect Manuscript reports research that is worth doing, that will make a contribution if well conducted and well reported.

A. Some criteria for worthy research:

1. asks questions of clear interest to the field.

2. states questions clearly in testable form.

3. uses appropriate, reliable, valid methods.

4. achieves results that illuminate the questions asked. Results most often are positive support for the hypotheses, but may be negative, if illuminating; e.g., contrary to previous findings and persuasive.

5. has sampled across subjects, situations, methods and measures, so that the results can be generalized beyond the local interests of the author and the author's locale.

B. Before describing the perfect manuscript, first, a few words about the review process for most APA journals and many others in psychology. If you have followed the instructions for submission to that journal, which are printed in the journal regularly, you will send several copies of the manuscript (3 to DP) all done up in perfect APA style with a brief cover letter asking the editor to consider the manuscript for publication. You will soon receive an acknowledgment of receipt telling you to which associate editor (if any) the paper has been assigned for review. Some manuscripts are rejected immediately by the editor as inappropriate for that journal or as hopelessly inept, but most are sent out for review. Before your manuscript is sent out

for review, it is blinded in most journals' review process. This means that the editor removes the face page with your name, any identifying footnotes, acknowledgements, and so forth. The manuscript is then sent out to reviewers who can only guess at your identity. Reviewers are members of the Board of Consulting Editors listed on the masthead of the journal and other good investigators in the field who are consulted less often. The editor or associate editor will try to select reviewers who know your area of research and have perspective on the important issues in the field. Usually, two reviews are sought; occasionally one and occasionally three or more. If all goes smoothly, you will receive two reviews and a letter from the editor telling you of the decision and recommendations for your manuscript within two months. If things go wrong, as they often do, the poor editor will be seeking two reviews from five or six reviewers, several of whom say they are too busy and fail to return the manuscript so that the editor can seek another reviewer. Meanwhile, you are justifiably anxious to know what has happened to your manuscript, the editor is tearing her hair out trying to meet APA guidelines for review lags, and the reviewer is feeling pressured. Alas, a volunteer system of peer review has its problems.

The major points I wish to make here are that the process by which manuscripts are reviewed is fairly standard, seeks to be fair, and tries to proceed with all deliberate speed. Alas, there are glitches in the system.

C. What, then, do reviewers and editors look for in manuscripts? How are they judged for quality or qualities that distinguish publishable from unpublishable manuscripts?

1. The Perfect Manuscript is well organized, evidencing logical thought processes by the author. Not all manuscripts lend themselves to exactly the same organization -- some need longer introductions, some longer methods sections, some longer results that need little discussion, or much discussion.

2. The Perfect Manuscript COMMUNICATES to readers; what the author understands about the research must be told coherently to readers, a common failing of manuscripts. Authors need to role-play readers, or to ask colleagues to play the role of naive readers.

3. The Perfect Manuscript is addressed to CRITICAL, skeptical readers; the manuscript should try to address readers' alternate hypotheses and interpretations of the results, should defend the form of the questions asked, consider other forms of the questions, marshall support for the author's choice of hypotheses, methods, and interpretation of results. Always imagine that one is speaking to opponents, not to one's intimate friends who share one's theoretical outlook.

4. The Perfect Manuscript is written in ENGLISH, not pseudo-scientific jargon. Some specialized words are needed in some circumstances (e.g., measurement words such as volts, EEG, internal scale), but most ideas and procedures can be described quite nicely in English. Good

English does not string three or four nouns together (intensity alternation treatment condition group) but uses phrases to describe the same ideas (children who were treated with alternation of high and low intensity stimuli).

5. The Perfect Manuscript begins with an appropriate review of the literature that led the author to the questions to be asked in the research. It is difficult to specify the breadth and thoroughness of a review because the criteria are loosely defined and poorly communicated to students. Two general principles are that the literature cited should represent both presently and historically the background for the research and should not be selectively biased toward the author's hypotheses. In an area that is rife with past research, one can cite exemplary papers and those that form a critical background (both positive and negative) for the present research.

6. The Perfect Manuscript uses appropriately sophisticated statistical analyses. There is overkill and there is naivete in these matters. On the overkill side is the too frequent use of elaborate ANOVA designs and analyses with too few subjects, so that some cells in the analysis have less than one subject! On the naive side is the use of many univariate comparisons when a single, multivariate procedure would serve far better. It is my impression that statistical procedures advance in sophistication and complexity on a daily basis, but there is no escape from keeping up with them if you want to publish empirical research.

7. The Perfect Manuscript makes appropriate claims for the scope and importance of the research. Manuscripts too often make exaggerated claims for the generality of results and their import for the field. To be publishable, a piece of research does not have to revolutionize an area, just make a contribution to its development. Most additions to knowledge are small steps in a continuing stream of research, which is okay if they are not steps backwards.

8. The Perfect Manuscript is written in perfect APA style! A Ph.D. in psychology ought to be awarded with a gift of the Publication Manual! It is senseless to submit a manuscript over which you have slaved and risked your self-esteem and to have it rejected out of hand because you committed one of the following needlessly common errors in format:

a. there is no abstract

b. portions of the manuscript are not double spaced, an error that is particularly common in Tables, footnotes, references, and the abstract. EVERYTHING in a psychology manuscript must be double spaced, even if Tables run to two or three pages. Remember that in printed form it will not look like that, but the typesetter has to be able to see and follow your text to put it accurately into type, and double spacing saves him lots of time and errors.

c. headings are not organized hierarchically in APA style. There are several levels of headings that help readers to see the

relative importance of the various portions of the paper. In this case the style is not for the printer but for the reader.

d. manuscript is too long or less often, too short. There are no fixed rules in most journals for the length of a manuscript (even if the instructions to authors say there are), but editors and reviewers are always concerned about the limitations of space in the journal, which has a fixed number of pages annually. From the author's point of view, this paper is exceedingly important and worthy of full, lengthy treatment; from the editor's vantage point, the manuscript is probably too long. Different editors have different standards of how long an article can be; some are more flexible than others. A rule of thumb is that few articles can exceed 20 to 25 manuscript pages, including Tables, Figures, references, and abstract. Another probability for authors to keep in mind is that the longer the manuscript, the more it must justify its existence in a journal.

e. manuscripts are too short if they do not provide enough information for reviewers (and later readers) to evaluate the research and the reasons for it. One solution to producing a brief manuscript that is fully informative to reviewers is to make the text and the tables included in the report as complete as you possibly can and to cover your doubts by submitting supplementary tables and methodological details with the manuscript to be reviewed. Most editors and reviewers will appreciate the extra materials if they are truly supplementary and

can answer questions they will have about, say, complete sets of factor loadings that will not be published, or full details of a procedure, or questionnaires that were used to collect the data.

II. The Perfect Author

A. Has a strong ego! On the one hand, she is not afraid of constructive criticism and on the other hand stands up for her point of view.

1. authors must anticipate and accept REJECTIONS. Nearly all manuscripts are initially rejected for many reasons, from fatal flaws to rather minor stylistic problems. Although none of us appreciates rejection and most of us experience twinges of self-doubt when the inevitable rejection letter arrives, it is crucial to an author's personal adjustment that she anticipate this outcome for initial submissions. Rather than sink into deep depression, one should give oneself a day to absorb the blow and then return to the reviews, which should provide substantive guidance for revision.

2. If the reviewers suggest that the research is badly designed or executed so that revisions of the manuscript will not render the work publishable, one has the choice of trying another journal, whose reviewers might not notice the fatal flaws or who might not agree with the original reviewers. (Reviewers are not infallible. . . .) You may have sent the paper to the wrong journal -- if you are reporting research on clinical interviews with parents of hyperactive children,

don't send the report to the Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, which publishes laboratory and experimental studies. The criticism you may get from the reviewers for one journal may be quite different from those of another.

Another option for the fatally flawed research effort is to consider the reviewers and editor's criticism and scrap the idea of publishing that research. Maybe the research is not worthy of publication, but now you know better how to proceed with the next study. At least you will not make the same mistakes again.

3. If the research is not fatally flawed, and the manuscript merely requires revision of its atrocities, then cheer up! The chances are that your research will eventually see publication. When you get the reviews and the letter from the editor, read carefully, between the lines if necessary, to understand what about the analyses, writing, organization, or whatever can be revised into an acceptable report.

4. In sum, an author needs a strong ego in order to make use of the editor's and reviewers' constructive advice, often perceived by authors as insulting attacks. Regrettably, there are occasional ad hominem comments in reviews, which editors dislike intensely. The editor has the choice of removing the remark from the review or of apologizing to the author for it. Sometimes, such remarks slip by us in our haste to process our piles of manuscripts; other times what the author may perceive as insulting may not appear so to an editor. An understanding author is also appreciated by editors.

B. The Perfect Author stands up for her Point of View in an Informed and Rational Way. If you suffer the inevitable rejection and find the editor's and reviewers' criticisms unreasonable, then write to the editor and appeal the decision with well-reasoned prose. Ask for additional reviewers, if you think that the particular reviewers who were probably consulted (reviews are usually blind) were not fair or informed. Suggest several reviewers who you feel are well qualified and impartial. It won't help your case to suggest reviewers who are closely allied with you or the research. It also will not help to accuse the editor or the reviewers of malevolence. In other words, RFPLY rationally, ask for further consideration, make helpful suggestions, and don't sulk or reprove.

C. The Perfect Author is Flexible about revisions that do not substantially alter the thrust of the manuscript. Part of ego strength is being able to compromise, to be able to see that others might see the matter differently, and to evaluate how strongly one should hold fast to an initial position. One of the (few) gratifying aspects of being an editor is the letters one gets from authors of rejected manuscripts and those who have survived the revisions that inevitably are asked and thanks the editor with instructions to thank the reviewers for their invaluable suggestions. Actually, we get such letters with fair frequency, which testifies, I suppose, to the continued validity of cognitive dissonance theory. Really, I think that many of my own manuscripts have been greatly improved by the two and three revisions I have been forced

to perform upon them at reviewers' and editors' insistence.

D. The Perfect Author Feels brave enough to consult with colleagues about the manuscript BEFORE submitting it to a journal. A lot of grief and rejections would be modified if more authors would take the time to get criticisms from their friends and associates before asking for more formal reviews in journal offices. There would be less to redo later if authors would take this simple step. I fear that too many would-be authors are afraid of the criticisms of close colleagues, but they fail to realize that all of us who write for journals have more initial rejections than acceptances to our credit. To repeat, the vast majority of manuscripts are rejected initially, so that any colleague you select to help you shape up the paper before you submit it will have experienced rejection and criticism, too.

E. The Perfect Author is PERSISTENT in pursuing a line of research even if she is not immediately rewarded with adoring reviews or instant publication. Authors need self-confidence to follow their own best judgment in the research they do; this is not to say blind ignorance of others' opinions, but the courage to disagree for a time until the research develops and the arguments become more persuasive to others. It may take three or four innovative studies to convince doubtful editors and reviewers that you are on to something important and publishable. Psychology provides many examples of this regrettable conservatism, but why should you have it any easier than those of us who have gone before?

F. The Perfect Author Learns from adversity; previous experience with rejections and revisions gives one knowledge of flaws to avoid and toughens one to future adversity. Rather than be defeated, one can rise above the emotional turmoil of the publication process and profit personally from it.

III. How to Become the Perfect Author of the Perfect Manuscript

A. Learn that you are a peer among rejected peers, not a lonely victim of arbitrary injustice. Act like a peer, consult others, offer to help your colleagues by reviewing their papers.

B. Participate in the Review Process by volunteering to be a reviewer. Most journals publish calls for volunteer reviewers; all you need to do is send a brief letter to the editor describing your areas of expertise and enclosing a curriculum vita. For your efforts at reviewing, you will gain experience with evaluating others' research and receive the review of another (probably more experienced) reviewer of the same manuscript. You can compare your judgment and suggestions to the author with those of the other reviewer and the editor and assess your own critical skills. After reviewing several manuscripts you will have a much better idea of what reviewers and editors find laudatory and lamentable in your own area of research. In the process, you will also learn that most other authors experience rejection, too. After a while you may become a member of an editorial board and an editor yourself.

C. Finally, screw up your courage and submit your research reports to journals. Do it PROMPTLY. Most research consists of the next small step in a field and is being taken concurrently by many investigators. It is likely that your report will become quickly out of date, unless you submit it promptly for publication. Most areas of research need five or six similar reports of results, not 50 or 60. So, send it in as soon as possible.

Authors of the world, Unite! You have nothing to lose but your anonymity!

Overcoming Common Barriers to Publishing Psychological Work

Stephanie B. Stolz

U.S. Public Health Service

Kansas City, Missouri

Dr. Stolz received her Ph.D. from the University of Washington in Seattle. She is currently the Director of the Division of Alcoholism, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Programs in the Kansas City Regional Office of the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Stolz has published in a number of journals as well as chapters in several books, and a book. A past associate editor, she is or has been on the editorial boards of six journals, and currently serves on the boards of two publications. Active in APA, she was a member of the APA Committee on Women in Psychology and as a member of that committee took the lead in designing the committee's study of the role of women in the editorial process in APA and non-APA Journals.

This paper deals with authors' experiences of barriers to publishing psychological work, presented from the authors' viewpoint rather than from the viewpoint of psychological journals, their editors, or reviewers. Editors (e.g., Scarr, Note 1) long for the perfect author; authors are what they are and are perfect in that sense, and they find barriers between themselves and expressing their perfection.

The path to publication is not smooth: barriers, obstacles, hurdles, and pitfalls confront us. In other aspects of our lives, we also find paths that are far from smooth, yet we manage to get to our destinations by going around or over a barrier, climbing out of a pit, taking another route altogether, or changing our method of transportation.

What is in the way on the route to publication? How can we reach our goal despite these obstacles? In this paper, I will discuss four common barriers to publishing psychological work, and suggest some techniques for overcoming them.

The Reluctance to Commit Oneself in Public

The first barrier is the reluctance to commit oneself in public. Many people find that although they can easily make theoretical innovations and describe their own research plans in front of their students, they do not make the same kinds of statements to a peer audience. Once they have told their classes, the notes on the idea get filed in a drawer.

It may be that such people are concerned to appear smart before

their peers, feel that they have been able to do so up to this point, and yet are sure that they are not as smart as they have led others to believe. Such persons might instruct themselves, "If I don't stick my neck out in public (by doing research, analyzing the literature, developing a theory, and then telling others about this work), everyone will go on believing I'm really smart. If I take the chance of doing the research, literature review, or theoretical analysis, then people will find out how dumb I really am!".

In my own experience, this barrier is extremely common. On the basis of conversations with numerous psychologists, I believe that among even the most famous of psychologists, many are sure that they are only momentarily fooling the world into thinking that they are smart. Actually, the prevalence of this barrier should be encouraging to all of us. If almost everyone has this barrier, at least to some extent, and some of us are very famous and well published anyway, this is not an insurmountable problem.

How can you deal with the reluctance to commit yourself in public? One useful strategy is simply to acknowledge that you have this barrier--and then get on with the job. Simply telling the truth about it, rather than attempting to fool yourself as well as others, often seems to be an effective way of surmounting this barrier. For myself, I have a sign on my office wall explaining that it is o.k. not to be o.k. When I am unwilling to commit myself on an issue, I recall that I probably fear

that others will find out that I really am incapable of handling that issue; I look at the sign ("it's o.k. not to be o.k."), acknowledge to myself my fear and my unwillingness, and then go ahead and make the public statement.

The Reluctance to Prepare a Written Summary of the Work Performed

This barrier, having to do with being reluctant to write down work once done, is closely related to the first one: It also involves public commitment, in this instance written rather than oral. We do a piece of research, and then file the data in the drawer--with the self-statement that one of these days the work will have to be written up. But one of these days does not come.

How can this barrier be overcome? How can the data get out of the drawer and into the word processor? As a behaviorist, I suggest some environmental design, using behavioral principles, especially contingent reinforcement, to control the relevant behavior. For example, if the target response is a written summary of psychological work already performed, approximate the response, first, by writing about the study in an informal letter to a friend. I hope that our friends and colleagues are reinforcing agents, who would support such a letter by responding with social reinforcement. Surely we all share the responsibility for shaping each others' professional behavior, not just for reinforcing final responses in the professional chain.

Other possible shaping steps to get the data from the drawer onto

the printed page might include summarizing the study for one's class (perhaps an undergraduate class first, and later a graduate-level course); presenting the study in a colloquium (one's own institution first, and later at some other university); and so on. Later in the shaping program, the study could be submitted as a poster to a convention. Preparing for such a presentation requires the development of a clear, brief statement describing the purpose, methods, and results of the study, as well as drawing the figures and preparing tables--leaving little to be done to prepare a manuscript for publication.

What consequences are available for these behaviors? In addition to praise from one's colleagues, self-praise--I did it!--might be functional in shaping and maintaining the behavior needed to produce a written summary of the work performed.

Fear of Rejection

Fear of rejection is a barrier that prevents people from submitting manuscripts for publication, even when the report of the study is in final form. The colloquium is delivered, the poster is presented, and then the outline, abstract, and figures get filed in the drawer.

The other speakers in this symposium (Scarr, Note 1; Barton, Note 2) described some techniques for reducing the probability that a manuscript would be rejected. Authors should choose the appropriate journal, prepare the manuscript in the correct style, and, of course, do good work. But fear of rejection often prevents manuscripts from getting to the journal

at all, so that even when good work has been done, the manuscript appropriately prepared, and the correct journal chosen, the manuscript still ends up in the drawer rather than the mail box.

What is the nature of the barrier that keeps the manuscript from being submitted, once prepared? This barrier may well have in common with those discussed above the fear of what other people will find out. Authors may think, "If the editor sees my manuscript, then the editor will know how truly dumb I am."

One possible method of overcoming this barrier may be simply to acknowledge it, the technique mentioned above in connection with the initial barrier. If so, the authors could well state to themselves that it is o.k. not to be o.k., and submit the manuscript.

In addition, find articles in the published literature that you feel are (at best) as good as your manuscript, and say, "If they'll publish that, surely they'll take my manuscript."

Conventions offer the opportunity for desensitization experiences, e.g., meeting and talking with journal editors and editorial board members about one's own work. Often, special sessions, both panels and conversation hours, are set up by the Association or by the journals explicitly to facilitate such author-reviewer dialogue. Social events also provide an opportunity for informal presentations of one's work to editors and reviewers, in the course of general conversation about common interests. Off-the-cuff feedback from editors and reviewers should never

be mistaken for formal evaluations; on the other hand, favorable off-the-cuff reactions ought to counteract one's fear of rejection.

Lack of Confidence in One's Own Evaluations

An example of this fourth barrier occurs when an author submits a manuscript and, when it is rejected by the first journal asked, files it in the drawer. The author's self-statement might be, "The editor and reviewers must be right; my judgment is no good compared to theirs." Even authors who have managed to surmount the scary barrier of submitting a manuscript to a journal find it a much more difficult barrier to re-submit a rejected manuscript.

This barrier has many aspects in common with another barrier, inappropriate pride in one's own work. An inappropriately prideful self-statement might be, "If they won't accept it the way I wrote it, to hell with them." In this case, a manuscript could even be accepted conditional on revision--and still get filed in the drawer!

In a way, all these barriers are the same. The author who admits that the manuscript needs changes also admits to having made errors--so a fear of being found out to be stupid could create defensive pride and a subsequent reluctance to make corrections. Likewise, the conviction that one is truly dumb leads one to accept all criticism as though it were unanswerable.

What are the realities here? Editors may be right or wrong. Feedback from reviewers and editors may be helpful and supportive--or uninformative

and nasty. Manuscripts do get returned for revision, or get rejected.

But what is your goal? Really, it is to get the work completed, written up, and published, not to be praised, declared right, helped, or supported. So whatever may happen, including requests for revisions, rejection, helpful letters, or nasty letters, you need to design your environment so that it gets you to work on getting published, rather than letting you say that your paper is perfect, you couldn't possibly have used the wrong anova, etc., or that the editor is perfect and you couldn't possibly answer those criticisms, etc. If your goal is publication, then necessary behaviors include modifying the manuscript, changing journals, or both.

Note that I have not mentioned alternatives that involve setting aside or discarding this particular manuscript, alternatives such as running additional subjects, redesigning the study, or taking up a different line of research. The point of this paper is to outline techniques for getting psychological manuscripts published, regardless. Research on the publication process in psychology has shown that psychological manuscripts always get published if their authors persist in sending them to journals. The question here is not whether a manuscript should be published, but only how to get it published, how to get the authors to persist.

To handle a request for revision when you lack confidence in your own evalution, talk with senior people in the field about their experiences

with submitting manuscripts. You will find that they, too, are told to make major revisions, and that they, too, get rejections. Learning that first hand may help. Then, revise your original manuscript to respond to the reviewers' comments as much as your own professional judgment and your principles allow. It's not that reviewers and editors are either right or wrong; it's simply that they are often a fair sample of your future readers. Revising a paper so that it communicates to them is always worthwhile because it increases the likelihood that your manuscript will then communicate more clearly to other readers. And note that experienced publishers always have ready a list of alternative appropriate journals--six, eight, or even more alternatives--so that when the rejection comes, you can send your (revised) manuscript to the next one on the list.

Conclusions

As psychologists, we are supposed to know about the control of behavior--even our own. Getting psychological work published is the result of a sequence of behaviors, including researching, writing, mailing, and revising. Much of the advice that I have suggested in this paper is based on a behavioral approach, looking at one's history of reinforcement and the current environmental reinforcers. Whatever your own approach to behavior is, you should use that on yourself to develop the behaviors necessary for keeping that drawer empty and getting your psychological work into print. Scarr (Note 1) talks about ego strength and self-esteem;

I have discussed shaping, reinforcement, and a small variant of rational-emotive therapy. Whatever your conceptual scheme is, put it to use on your own behavior, so that you overcome your barriers and reach the goal of publishing your psychological work.

Reference Notes

1. Scarr, S. An editor looks for the perfect manuscript. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August 1981.

2. Bartol, K. M. Survey results from editorial board members: Lethal and nonlethal errors. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August 1981.

Footnote

I thank D. M. Baer for his comments on the manuscript and for being a reinforcing agent. The opinions expressed here are mine and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Manuscript Faults and Review Board Recommendations: Lethal and Nonlethal Errors

Kathryn M. Bartol

College of Business and Management

University of Maryland

College Park, Maryland

Dr. Bartol received a Ph.D. in organizational behavior and management from Michigan State University. She is Professor of Management and Organizational Behavior in the College of Business and Management, University of Maryland, College Park.

Dr. Bartol's publications have appeared in about a dozen different journals, her presented papers have been published in meetings proceedings and she is the author of a book on male and female leaders in small work groups.

She has held several professional offices and is currently a member of the Board of Governors of the Academy of Management. She serves on the editorial review boards of three journals at present including the Journal of Vocational Behavior and does reviews for three others as well.

With rejection rates for many prestigious journals falling above 90 percent, it is easy to dispair of ever having a paper accepted. Certainly the filtering process is quite stringent and yet many authors are successful in having their materials published. The purpose of this paper is to provide some insight into the role of editorial review board members in the filtering process. Specifically, this paper will discuss the influence of various manuscript shortcomings on the publishability recommendations that review board members are likely to make to their editors.

In the usual manuscript review scenario, a paper is mailed to an editor who takes a brief look at the manuscript to determine if it is an appropriate topic for the journal. If the paper clearly is not appropriate, the editor may reject the manuscript at this early stage and return it to the author or to the designated author in the case of multiple authors. Otherwise, the editor sends the manuscript to two or more reviewers who are knowledgeable about the subject of the manuscript. The reviewers frequently are members of the journal's editorial review board; but many journals also use ad hoc reviewers. Ad hoc reviewers are scholars who are not members of a particular editorial review board but whom the editor considers competent to review journal manuscripts. Ad hoc reviewers are used to reduce the work load of the editorial review board and also to broaden the base of expertise available to the editor. In the typical case, an editor may use two editorial review board members or one editorial review board member and one ad hoc reviewer to review a particular manuscript.

The comments sent back to the editor by the reviewers constitute the main basis for action by the editor. If the two reviewers disagree substantially on a recommendation, the editor may send the manuscript to additional reviewers for their evaluation. Although the exact categories may differ across journals, reviewers typically are asked to make judgments which fall into one of the following four categories: (1) Accept without revision, (2) Accept, but ask author to correct problem, (3) Revise and resubmit, and (4) Reject the manuscript.

Accept without revision recommendations are relatively rare. This is largely because manuscripts frequently have fairly common faults which must be rectified. Also the reviewers are experts in the area of the manuscript and can make constructive suggestions for improving the paper. Recommendations that a paper be accepted, but asking the author to make changes are sometimes made. If the changes required are anything but very minor alterations, it is more common to suggest that the manuscript be revised and resubmitted.

A revise and resubmit recommendation provides control to be sure that the manuscript has successfully made the revisions suggested by the reviewers. As a result, most manuscripts that are published, originally were returned to the author with a recommendation that the manuscript be revised and resubmitted. Accordingly, it is important for new authors to realize that a revise and resubmit recommendation from an editor is a relatively positive sign and should not be viewed as a rejection.

Rather it is an opportunity to attempt to revise the manuscript in accordance with the recommendations of the reviewers. Frequently in the letter in which the author is advised to revise and resubmit, the editor will mention the most serious objections which must be addressed. The author should attempt to make sure that the review deals with these objections as well as others mentioned by the reviewers. If the revision does not successfully overcome the objections of the reviewers, it will ultimately be rejected. Statistics vary; but based on discussions with several editors, I would estimate that a revise and resubmit paper has a better than 50 percent chance of finally being accepted. The more the author is able to meet the objections and suggestions of the reviewers, the higher the likelihood that the revised version will be accepted upon review.

Unfortunately, most manuscripts never make it to the revise and resubmit stage. They are rejected. They are rejected by the reviewers for what can be viewed as "lethal" errors. These are manuscript faults which are serious and appear to be uncorrectable. On the other hand, revise and resubmit recommendations are made when the faults of the manuscript appear to be potentially correctable. These types of errors can be termed "nonlethal" because they are less likely to lead to the demise or rejection of the manuscript. While it is important to attempt to avoid as many manuscript faults as possible, from a practical point of view, it is particularly important to avoid lethal errors which are

highly likely to lead to a rejection of the manuscript during the first round of reviews.

Based on my experience as a review board member for the Academy of Management Review and the Journal of Vocational Behavior, as well as an ad hoc reviewer for a number of journals (including Academy of Management Journal, Journal of Applied Psychology, Administrative Science Quarterly, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, and others), I have given considerable thought to manuscript characteristics which can be considered lethal versus nonlethal errors. Lethal errors lead to an initial rejection rather than to a reviewer recommendation of revise and resubmit.

As part of my preparation for this discussion of the review process, I prepared a list of what I consider to be lethal versus nonlethal errors in manuscripts. In order to make the list as useful as possible, I conducted an informal survey among 15 colleagues at the University of Maryland who are on review boards of psychology-related journals, such as Developmental Psychology, Journal of Applied Psychology, Brain, Behavior and Human Performance, Academy of Management Journal, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, and others. It should be emphasized that this was not a formal study. Rather the purpose was to provide some confirmation or discomfirmation of the utility of the list for author use.

The review board members were presented a list of 20 possible faults in a manuscript. They were asked to assume for each item listed that it

constituted the main fault of the manuscript. They were then asked to check what their recommendation would likely be: (1) reject, (2) revise and resubmit for further review, (3) accept but ask the author(s) to correct the problem, and (4) not sure. One difficulty which several review board members noted on the survey is that many times a manuscript has multiple errors. Hence multiple errors of a nonlethal nature can lead a review board member to reject a manuscript that otherwise would receive a revise and resubmit recommendation. Although there were some differences of opinion, the level of consensus was sufficient to suggest that the list of manuscript faults could be categorized by the likelihood that they would lead to a recommendation of reject, revise and resubmit for further review, and accept but ask the author(s) to correct the problem. The items, which were listed in ramdom order on the survey, are rearranged by likely reviewer recommendation in Table 1. The errors will be discussed within each reviewer recommendation category below.

Recommendation: Reject

Five manuscript errors or characteristics were confirmed by the survey as likely to lead to a reviewer recommendation of reject. Such errors are lethal in the sense that they are likely to lead to the immediate demise of the manuscript. As mentioned previously, most of the lethal errors have the common characteristic that they are difficult or impossible to correct. They are inherent characteristics of the manuscript by the time that the manuscript reaches the review process

and usually cannot be altered in a manner that would make the manuscript acceptable. The following errors are likely to be lethal manuscript faults from the point of view of the reviewers:

1. Inappropriate topic for journal. All journals have domains of subject matter which they consider appropriate for their particular publication. Frequently such domains are stated, at least in general terms, in a policy statement in the journals. However, the best way to get a feel for appropriate subject matter is to examine issues of the journal spanning two or more years. When a topic is obviously inappropriate, the editor usually will immediately reject the manuscript. For example, a child development article submitted to Organizational Behavior and Human Performance is likely to be screened out by the editor. If the inappropriateness is not obvious from the title and abstract or if the manuscript is marginally appropriate, the manuscript may spend two or three months in the review process only to be ultimately rejected because of topic inappropriateness.

2. Outdated research question. It is not uncommon for a manuscript to address an issue with little or no reference to or consideration of relevant previous literature. Such research often is not offered as a replication or a replication and extension of previous research; rather it is presented as if it were a unique approach. For example, a paper limited to showing a positive relationship between job satisfaction and turnover would not add much to the literature at this point in the stream

of research on turnover. It is important to carefully review relevant literature before designing a study, so that previous findings can be given appropriate consideration in formulating research questions of current interest. Otherwise a manuscript may be rejected because the issue adds little or nothing to what is already known.

3. Measures of unknown validity and/or reliability. Many manuscripts use measures which apparently were constructed for the particular research but provide no basis for establishing the validity and/or reliability of such measures. Frequently even the theoretical rationale for the item construction is not established in the manuscript. Such measures usually are difficult to accept and the paper is rejected.

4. Measures of low validity and/or reliability. Manuscripts sometimes rely on measures which have known validity and/or reliability. It is always a good idea to check available data on any measure which one wishes to use in research. This can be done through journal articles evaluating some of the more current measures being used and by consulting standard references on measurement (e.g., Buros).

5. Faulty research design. Frequently the research described has not been designed appropriately to test the hypotheses advance. For example, a number of manuscripts have been produced which purport to document characteristics of female managers based strictly on a sample of female managers. Without a group of male managers for comparison, however, it is inappropriate to attempt to draw conclusions about the behavior of female managers that are attributable to their gender.

The errors in this section have been labeled lethal because they are likely to lead to an immediate rejection of a manuscript. This is largely because the types of errors which fall in the lethal category are usually not alterable to a degree sufficient to make the manuscript acceptable to the journal. Errors that appear to be correctable are more likely to result in a recommendation of revise and resubmit for further review.

Recommendation: Revise and Resubmit for Further Review

Eleven manuscript errors or characteristics were most likely to lead to a reviewer recommendation of revise and resubmit for further review. As discussed earlier, most manuscripts which are ultimately published originally received a recommendation of revise and resubmit. The types of errors which fall in the revise and resubmit category are those which appear to be potentially fixable.

1. Inadequate review of the literature. It sometimes happens that a manuscript presents an inadequate review of the literature, even though the research itself is highly relevant to the subject area. It is not necessary or even desirable that a review of the literature section of a paper contain a copious review of all relevant literature. However, it is important to cite major directly relevant studies, and particularly those of recent vintage, in establishing the need for the research. Occasionally important studies are missing from a manuscript and the situation is correctable. Under most circumstances, a failure to

adequately review the literature leads to a poor research project and a lethal error.

2. Inappropriate citations. Citations usually are inappropriate for one of two reasons. First, the citations refer to studies which are largely irrelevant to the research. Second, the citations are falsely used to support research findings. Occasionally errors of this type are correctable. If the citation problems are pervasive and do not provide adequate literature support for the research, the manuscript is likely to be rejected by the reviewers.

3. Unclear introductory section. Many manuscripts have introductory sections which are fairly obscure. They commonly mention studies which are not directly relevant to the issues advanced and highlight variables which cannot subsequently be found in the methodology section. The purpose of the introduction is to let the reader know what will be studied and why. Discussions outside the scope of the actual research add confusion. If the research study is valuable, reviewers are likely to note the introductory section difficulties and ask for a revision. Otherwise, the manuscript may well be rejected.

4. Unclear research question. Manuscripts often do not describe the methodology used in the study in sufficient detail for the reviewer to make an adequate evaluation of the manuscript. As a rule of thumb, the methodology should be specific enough that it would be possible for another researcher to replicate the study based on the information given.

The reviewer should not have to wonder about exactly how the study was conducted or the sequence of events in conducting the study.

5. Inappropriate analysis techniques. Research studies sometimes use analyses which are incorrect for the type of data. This occurs, for example, when parametric tests are used with ordinal data. Analyses also may be inappropriate in the sense that a more suitable or powerful type of analysis may be possible. An example of a more appropriate analysis might be the substitution of MANOVA for ANOVA when the data contain multiple related dependent variables.

6. Inadequate description of sample. It is surprising how many manuscripts do not include basic information about the source of the sample and how the sample was drawn. For example, describing a sample simply as 200 industrial workers leaves the reader to wonder at least about the type of work, type of industry, and how the sample was obtained. If the study appears to be sound otherwise, the review may recommend that the sample description be revised and a resubmission made for further evaluation. If further description then reveals inadequacies, the manuscript will ultimately be rejected.

7. Unclear methodology. Manuscripts often do not describe the methodology used in the study in sufficient detail for the reviewer to make an adequate evaluation of the manuscript. As a rule of thumb, the methodology should be specific enough that it would be possible for another researcher to replicate the study based on the information

given. The reviewer should not have to wonder about exactly how the study was conducted or the sequence of events in conducting the study.

8. Measures inadequately described. This item is related to unclear methodology, but happens frequently enough to merit separate mention. Manuscripts which give insufficient information regarding the measures used make it difficult for the reviewer to make a final judgment regarding publishability. If the research questions being explored have merit in the judgment of the reviewer, the reviewer may suggest a revise and resubmit to obtain further information regarding the measures. If the measures are not sound, the revised manuscript will be rejected.

9. Unclear analysis. The analysis used in evaluating the data sometimes is not explained clearly, again leaving the reviewer in a difficult position to evaluate the paper fully. For example, manuscripts using multiple regression analysis frequently do not provide sufficient information regarding the order in which the variables entered the regression equation or appropriate statistics regarding incremental changes associated with the variable under consideration. Such shortcomings, while annoying, often are correctable.

10. Discussion section poorly conceived. An otherwise good paper sometimes can be faulted for having a discussion section which wanders, makes dubious connections to only marginally related research, or just rehashes the results section. Such maladies usually require a fairly substantial rewrite of the discussion section, necessitating a second review of the paper.

11. Paper is too lengthy. When the main fault of a paper is that it is too lengthy, reviewers frequently suggest a revise and resubmit in order to be sure that the cuts in length are made appropriately. It is a good idea in gaging the appropriate length to look at similar papers which have appeared in the journal to which you intend to send your paper.

Clearly it is best to avoid as many of these nonlethal errors as possible in order to enhance the possibility that the reviewers will recommend a revise and resubmit or an acceptance.

Recommendation: Accept but Ask Author(s) to Correct Problem

A recommendation to accept a manuscript but ask author(s) to correct problem is a much stronger recommendation than a revise and resubmit recommendation. This is because such a recommendation, if it is followed by the editor, means that the paper is actually accepted at this point. Most editors will still protect themselves from the possibility that an author will refuse to make necessary changes by making the acceptance contingent on making the requested changes. Under most circumstances, the paper will not be sent to the reviewers for a second review. Instead, the editor will make the determination that the minor corrections have been made. This differs from the revise and resubmit recommendation where the manuscript usually goes to reviewers for a second review. Two types of errors fell into the category of accept but ask author(s) to correct problem.

1. Poor writing style. Paper frequently uses writing styles that

are wordy, flowery, and/or somewhat obtuse. If the writing problem appears to be correctable with some careful editing, it is likely that the reviewer will recommend that the paper actually be accepted conditional on correcting writing style problems. It is, of course, far better to avoid writing style problems in any paper submitted to a journal, since a particular reviewer may be reluctant to accept an article with writing difficulties. In fact, there is no reason to submit such a paper. Before submitting a paper have a colleague or two read the paper to point out areas where the writing style can be improved.

2. Discussion section goes beyond data. Researchers sometimes get overly enthusiastic about their research findings and attempt to draw broader conclusions than the actual data would warrant. This problem is usually easily corrected once the problem is pointed out to the author. For this reason, the reviewer may recommend that the paper be accepted contingent on the problem being resolved.

Conclusion

If one wishes to conduct research which is ultimately publishable, then it is imperative to avoid the types of errors that are likely to lead to an initial review recommendation that the manuscript be rejected. In studying the list of reject items, it is clear that such difficulties mainly must be avoided at the point that the original research is conceived. By the time the researcher is writing the manuscript, it already is too late to overcome such issues as an outdated research

question, measures of unknown or questionable validity and reliability, and faulty research designs. Thus the failure of much research to reach publication is not really a writing problem as much as it is a research quality problem.

As mentioned previously, most manuscripts published in high quality journals initially received a recommendation of revise and resubmit from reviewers. This is because it is difficult to produce a perfect manuscript (indeed, absolutely perfect research is virtually impossible), many authors commit nonlethal errors, and the reviewers are typically experts in the subject area and have useful subject-related suggestions to make. I have discovered that some new authors become discouraged by the manuscript criticisms that accompany a revise and resubmit letter from an editor and do not resubmit a revised manuscript. They falsely assume the worst based on the critical comments and do not follow up on the invitation to revise and resubmit.

Sometimes even the best efforts to avoid lethal errors and most nonlethal faults lead to a rejected manuscript. This outcome may be due to characteristics of the manuscript. It is also useful to remember that the review process is not perfect. Reviewers may be overly critical in the sense that they may recommend rejection of manuscripts that another set of reviewers may have viewed more favorably. If the reviewers comments really seem unjustified, an author can consider writing a letter to the editor outlining the difficulties in the reviews. It is prudent

to be sure that you have very strong arguments before proceeding in this direction.

In coping with potential rejection, it is helpful to have one or two journals in mind to which you intend to submit your manuscipt if it is rejected by your first choice. Having the next step planned restrains authors from filing possibly publishable manuscripts in file drawers for long lengths of time while they try to decide what to do with them next. Part of the secret of publishing success is to keep the best manuscripts that you can produce out in the review process.

Figure 1

Manuscript Faults and Reviewer Recommendations

Likely reviewer recommendations are based on the assumption that the item listed is the main fault with the manuscript.

Recommendation: Reject

1. Inappropriate topic for journal
2. Outdated research question
3. Measures of unknown validity and/or reliability
4. Measures of low validity and/or reliability
5. Faulty research design

Recommendation: Revise and Resubmit for Further Review

1. Inadequate review of literature
2. Inappropriate citations
3. Unclear introductory section
4. Unclear research question
5. Inappropriate analysis techniques
6. Inadequate description of sample
7. Unclear methodology
8. Measures inadequately described
9. Unclear analysis
10. Discussion section poorly conceived
11. Paper is too lengthy

Recommendation: Accept but Ask Author(s) to Correct Problem

1. Poor writing style
2. Discussion section goes beyond data

Another Voice on the Publishing of Manuscripts

Jacqueline Goodchilds

University of California

Los Angeles, California

Dr. Goodchilds served as symposium discussant. She has her Ph.D. in Social Psychology from Cornell University and is Associate Professor at University of California, Los Angeles. She is Past Editor of the Journal of Social Issues, a member of the Committee on Women in Psychology, and a member of APA's Publications and Communication Board.

Consider about the title of this monograph: Understanding the manuscript review process and increasing women's participation in it. What a marvelously helpful topic. Except that to understand the process is not to love it and simply to increase the participation of women is not an adequate goal.

Smoothing and easing the way into the system for women and others who need help (and who among psychologists does not?) and increasing our effectiveness as participants are worthy goals. These papers represent valuable information from people well qualified to inform us. I applaud them and what they have written -- nitty-gritty guides and guidelines, insights and clarifications. We do need to learn how and how most effectively to fit in and advance within psychology, which importantly involves publishing. We're referring to journal publishing, leaving aside for the time the questions about other sorts of publishing (books) and publicizing (media).

But, lest we forget or overlook in our haste to become part of the established system, the system is not ours. It has been in place and operative for some years. It is far from perfect. In fact, the publishing system is badly troubled. None would deny or dispute that fact. The woman's view could help. Surely the newly arriving, newly involved, can see most clearly the flaws and lapses, and we have an obligation to help improve things.

Think for a moment about change, about the need for change and the means to change. The Publication system within our discipline now serves more as (a) a point system for one's personal career goals--the everlengthening vita; and (b) an archive in which to file away

accumulating data points. It poorly serves what I personally conceive of as its main intended purpose: to communicate from one to another information about our science and our profession.

I serve on APA's Publication and Communication Board. This is the group of psychologists whose responsibility it is to oversee, manage, direct, control the APA publication enterprise, mainly our "primary" journals. These people meet two or three times a year and struggle manfully (sic) to comprehend the multidimensional space of psychology's publishing enterprise. We are concerned about (1) the mix of journals matched to the changing sub-areas in our field, (2) cost benefits versus centrality to the discipline and who is to define centrality, (3) balancing considerations of page allocation, submission rate, rejection rate, and publication lag (shuffling deck chairs on the Titanic), and (4) the modern problems (the assumption being that there was a halcyon time when these problems did not exist of glut, fraud, and faddism. About that terrible trio, presently there is too much being published; we have recently begun to recognize that we have in our group unethical types publishing fraudulent data; and we have a major problem with fads. The last is usually referred to as mainstream drift.

Do you realize that there is no mechanism for change in the established set-up of journals? We have 16 or 17 basic content journals and they do not include journals to cover several currently burgeoning research areas: women, age, ethnic minorities, gays. Prestige accrues to those who publish in APA journals; yet for certain types of content there exists no prestigious outlet. We need careful thoughtful attention to what needs to be done to redress this wrong, or fill these lacunae, whichever.

Finally, I refer you to a talk given at the 1980 convention in Montreal (available in the Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 37, #1, 1981). It is the Kurt Lewin award address by Marie Jahoda. Bless her, she titled her presentation, "To Publish or Not to Publish." Here is a woman who is an honored part of the system but who retains her perspective. She proceeded to knock 'em dead by raising the question of balancing the duty to publish with the right and/or need to publish. She detailed the reasons and rationale for "not publishing everything one ever does." Given the glut, she asked, can we favor deliberately withholding material from press? "Yes," she says. I commend her talk and her thought to us all.